REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, and 16-21, are pending and under consideration. Claims 3, 7, 11, and 15 are canceled herein without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 5, 9, 13, and 17 are amended herein. Claims 18-21 are added herein. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 5, 9, 13, and 17 may be found in claims 3, 7, 11, and 15 as filed originally. Support for new claims 18-20 may be found in Fig. 1, and in the specification at page 8, lines 1-4. Reconsideration is requested based on the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Response to Arguments:

The Applicants appreciate the consideration given to their arguments, and the new grounds of rejection. Further consideration is requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102:

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, and 16-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,629,316 to Curtis (hereinafter “Curtis”). The rejection is traversed to the extent it might apply to the claims as amended.

The last two clauses of claim 1 recite:

> Wherein the script is encrypted.
> Said system further comprises a module decrypting the encrypted script.

Curtis neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "wherein the script is encrypted,” or “a module decrypting the encrypted script," as recited in claim 1. Curtis, in fact, mentions no encryption at all. The final Office Action asserts with respect to canceled claim 3 that Curtis describes encryption and decryption at column 5, lines 28-34. This is submitted to be incorrect. Curtis, rather, describes other functions of the toolkit at column 5, lines 28-34, such as providing install property objects that contain variables as values that become defined for a specific operating environment, not "decrypting the encrypted script," as recited in claim 1. In particular, as described at column 5, lines 28, 29, and 30:

> Other functions of the tool kit include i) providing install property objects that contain variables as values that become defined for a specific operating environment.

Since Curtis is providing install property objects that contain variables as values that become defined for a specific operating environment, Curtis does not describe "wherein the script is encrypted,” or “a module decrypting the encrypted script," as recited in claim 1.

Curtis, moreover, describes other functions of the toolkit, such as enabling a property value to be temporarily overridden, not "decrypting the encrypted script," as recited in claim 1. In particular, as described at column 5, lines 30 and 31:

> ii) enabling a property value to be temporarily overridden.

Since Curtis is enabling a property value to be temporarily overridden, Curtis does not describe "wherein the script is encrypted," or "a module decrypting the encrypted script," as recited in claim 1.

Curtis, moreover, describes other functions of the toolkit, such as a software state machine that enables a programmer to easily customize an install program by merely adding, deleting, or changing the various states that contain the functions and flow of control of the program, not "decrypting the encrypted script," as recited in claim 1. In particular, as described at column 5, lines 31-34:

> iii) a software state machine that enables a programmer to easily customize an install program by merely adding, deleting, or changing the various states that contain the functions and flow of control of the program.

Since Curtis has a software state machine that enables a programmer to easily customize an install program by merely adding, deleting, or changing the various states that contain the functions and flow of control of the program, Curtis does not describe "wherein the script is encrypted," or "a module decrypting the encrypted script," as recited in claim 1.

Curtis, moreover, describes other functions of the toolkit, such as automatically detecting a programming error if a programmer incorrectly specifies a nonexistent state within the state machine, not "decrypting the encrypted script," as recited in claim 1. In particular, as described at column 5, lines 35, 36, and 37:

> iv) automatically detecting a programming error if a programmer incorrectly specifies a nonexistent state within the state machine; v) automatically selecting a system-dependent function,

Since Curtis is automatically detecting a programming error if a programmer incorrectly specifies a nonexistent state within the state machine, Curtis does not describe "wherein the script is encrypted," or "a module decrypting the encrypted script," as recited in claim 1.

Curtis, finally, uses human readable logs for both the install and uninstall processes. The logs are human readable to allow them to be checked to ensure that a file has installed successfully. In particular, as described at column 5, lines 48-51:

> Logs are used for both the install and uninstall process. Furthermore, these logs are human readable which allows them to be checked, e.g., after a silent install, to ensure that a file has installed successfully.

If the logs were encrypted, on the other hand, they would not be human readable. If the logs were encrypted, in particular, they could not be checked to ensure that a file has installed successfully, which is what Curtis wants to be able to do. Curtis, consequently, would not want "wherein the script is encrypted," as recited in claim 1, since then they could not be checked to ensure that a file has installed successfully. Claim 1 is thus submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 2 and 4 depend from claim 1 and add additional distinguishing elements. Claims 2 and 4 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2 and 4 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, and 16:

> The last two clauses of claims 5, 9, and 13 recite substantially:
>
> Wherein the script is encrypted.
> Said system further comprises a module decrypting the encrypted script.

Curtis neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "wherein the script is encrypted," or “a module decrypting the encrypted script," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Claims 5, 9, and 13 are submitted to be allowable as well, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5, 9, and 13 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, and 16 depend from claim 5, claim 9, or claim 13 and add additional distinguishing elements. Claims 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, and 16 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, and 16 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 17:

> The second and third clauses of claim 17 recite:
>
> Encrypting a script.
> Decrypting the encrypted script.

Curtis neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests, “encrypting a script,” or “decrypting the encrypted script," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Claim 17 is thus submitted to be allowable as well, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the

rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 17 is earnestly solicited.

New claims 18-21:

Claims 18-21 depend from claims 1, 5, 9, and 13, respectively, and add further distinguishing elements. Claims 18-21 in particular, recite:

Combining the decrypted script with a readout setting file.

None of the cited references teaches, discloses, or suggests encryption or decryption as discussed above. Claims 18-21 are thus believed to be allowable as well.

Conclusion:

Accordingly, in view of the reasons given above, it is submitted that all of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, and 16-21 are allowable over the cited references. Allowance of all claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, and 16-21 and of this entire application is therefore respectfully requested.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing this Amendment, please charge them to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: March 2, 2009

By: /Thomas E. McKiernan/
Thomas E. McKiernan
Registration No. 37,889

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501